

Recent results on UV-regularisation through UV-modified uncertainty relations*

Achim Kempf†

Department of Applied Mathematics & Theoretical Physics
Cambridge CB3 9EW, U.K

1 Introduction

It is well known that when trying to resolve sufficiently small distances the required test particles of short wave length and high energy will have a gravitational effect that significantly disturbs the space time structure which is being probed. Even simple dimensional analysis shows that therefore a theory of quantum gravity is needed the latest at the Planck scale of about $10^{-35}m$. The very notions of points and distances are in question at this scale. This problem has been approached from various directions, among the vast literature, see e.g. [1]-[7].

Whatever final form a fundamental theory of quantum gravity at the Planck scale will take, it seems reasonable to assume that it will express spatial information through some formal matrices or operators $\mathbf{x}_i$. After all, formal position operators are present in quantum field theory: technically, the fields in the path integral form a representation of a Heisenberg algebra of hermitean positions $\mathbf{x}_\mu = \mathbf{x}_\mu^*$ and momenta $\mathbf{p}_\mu = \mathbf{p}_\mu^*$ which obey the quantum mechanical commutation relations $[\mathbf{x}_\mu, \mathbf{p}_\nu] = i\hbar\eta_{\mu\nu}$, see e.g. [8, 9]. Of course, these operators do not have a simple quantum mechanical interpretation. But, their presence in quantum field theory means that even if, hypothetically, the fundamental quantum gravity theory were not to contain anything close to formal position operators, formal linear position operators would still have to emerge from the fundamental theory the latest at that scale at which $(3+1)$ - dimensional quantum field theory becomes a valid description, which is probably not very far from the Planck scale. In the absence of direct experimental access to these scales it is instructive to analyse the full set of possible short distance structures which linear position operators can describe.

To be precise, we make the weak assumption that these $\mathbf{x}_i$ are elements of an associative, complex and possibly noncommutative algebra with the involution in the algebra acting as $\mathbf{x}_i^* = \mathbf{x}_i$. Without further assumptions, what can be said about the set of all possible short distance structures which can be described in this way?

*Talk presented at the 5th Wigner Symposium, Vienna, August 1997

†Research Fellow of Corpus Christi College in the University of Cambridge

2 Self-adjoint versus symmetric position operators

Under the above assumption, simple functional analytical arguments show that there are in fact only three distinct short distance structures which can arise, with all other cases being mixtures of the three:

Consider an element $\mathbf{x}$ in an associative complex algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with the involution acting as $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{x}$. A representation of $\mathcal{A}$, and thus of $\mathbf{x}$, on a maximal dense domain D in a Hilbert space H can now reveal three possible features of $\mathbf{x}$: The operator $\mathbf{x}$ may be self-adjoint, in which case there are the two possibilities of $\mathbf{x}$ having (I) a discrete spectrum or (II) a continuous spectrum. Or, and this is the third case, (III), $\mathbf{x}$ may not be self-adjoint but merely symmetric. It will be crucial that in the case III, $\mathbf{x}$ cannot be diagonalised in D .

In the cases I and II, $\mathbf{x}$ describes the familiar short distance structures of the lattice and the continuum (or mixtures of both). The case III is the only alternative, because any Hilbert space representation of the elements of the algebra together with the involution in the algebra ensures at least that $\forall |\psi\rangle \in D : \langle \psi | \mathbf{x} | \psi \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, which is to say that the operator $\mathbf{x}$ is symmetric. As will be explained below, what makes this third short distance structure an interesting candidate is that it does not require the breaking of translation invariance, as opposed to the lattice, while it indeed also provides an ultraviolet cutoff, as opposed to the continuum.

3 Uncertainty relations and commutation relations

We recall that symmetry of an operator means that in its domain all expectation values are real - without however ensuring that it is diagonalisable or that it has any eigenvectors at all. It will be convenient to consider now the uncertainty in positions $\Delta x_{|\psi\rangle} = \langle \psi | (\mathbf{x} - \langle \psi | \mathbf{x} | \psi \rangle)^2 | \psi \rangle^{1/2}$ (for $|\psi\rangle$ normalised). It is well defined on D and we can use it as a (nonlinear) ‘indicator functional’ $\Delta x : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ because it vanishes for eigenvectors, and only for eigenvectors.

In the self-adjoint cases I and II clearly $\inf_{|\psi\rangle \in D} \Delta x_{|\psi\rangle} = 0$. When $\mathbf{x}$ is merely symmetric this may also hold, as $\mathbf{x}$ may still have some (normalisable or nonnormalisable) eigenvectors - we can always tensor a symmetric $\mathbf{x}$ with a self-adjoint matrix or operator which then contributes its eigenvectors. This would be a mixed case.

Let us focus instead on ‘pure’ cases of type III, where there exists a Δx_0 such that $\inf_{|\psi\rangle \in D} \Delta x_{|\psi\rangle} = \Delta x_0 > 0$. One then deals with a geometry in which all physical states describe particles which are not better localised (or not ‘smaller’) than some finite value Δx_0 . We therefore conclude that in these cases of type III, the uncertainty relations must contain correction terms which modify their behaviour in the ultraviolet to the effect that the smallest position uncertainty is finite.

As a simple case in one dimension, an uncertainty relation with suitable correction terms takes the form $\Delta x \Delta p \geq \hbar/2(1 + \beta(\Delta p)^2 + \dots)$ which implies $\Delta x_0 = \hbar\sqrt{\beta}$, see e.g. [10, 11]. (Note that not all choices of correction terms would lead to a case III situation). From $\Delta A \Delta B \geq 1/2 |\langle [A, B] \rangle|$ which holds for all symmetric A, B we deduce the commutation relations $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}] = i\hbar(1 + \beta \mathbf{p}^2 + \dots)$. The representation theory then

indeed shows that $\mathbf{x}$ is an example of case III, i.e. $\mathbf{x}$ is symmetric and non-self-adjoint in all representations of the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ generated by $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{p}$, as first shown in [12].

4 External symmetry and UV regularisation

Concerning the preservation of symmetries, we can read off from the above commutation relation that it is invariant under translations $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x} + a$, $\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}$. Indeed, as shown in [13], in arbitrary dimensions both translation and rotation invariance can be preserved. The first order correction terms under this constraint are unique. The case III short distance structure is as well compatible with generalised symmetries, such as the quantum group $U_q(n)$, see [12].

To see the mechanism of ultraviolet regularisation in the quantum field theoretical path integral, recall again that the functional analysis of representations of the quantum mechanical canonical $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}$ -commutation relations on wave functions extends formally to representations on fields. In the presence of a finite lower bound Δx_0 to localisability the pointwise multiplication of fields is defined as the maximally local multiplication. The action functional and the path integral can be formulated representation independently and the Feynman rules follow straightforwardly. A crucial observation is that in the case III the above mentioned infimum is indeed a minimum which is taken in D , i.e. the maximally localised fields, formally written as $|x^{ml}\rangle$ obeying $\Delta x|_{x^{ml}} = \Delta x_0$ and $\langle x^{ml}|\mathbf{x}|x^{ml}\rangle = x$, are normalisable [14]. It can be shown that as a consequence the familiar distributions in the Feynman rules, such as $\delta(x - x') = \langle x^{ml}|x^{ml}\rangle$ and $G(x, x') = \langle x^{ml}|1/(\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2)|x'^{ml}\rangle$ turn regular functions. Thus their powers and products become well-defined, thereby regularising the ultraviolet [9, 14, 15].

5 Internal symmetries

The compatibility of this third short distance structure with internal symmetries has not yet been fully explored. However, there has already appeared a possible new mechanism for the emergence of internal symmetry spaces: Intuitively, the internal degrees of freedom appear as the remnants of those external degrees of freedom which one might have expected to have been ‘lost’ through the ultraviolet cutoff:

Not in the domain D of the external degrees of freedom, but in H , the $\mathbf{x}_i$ do have self-adjoint extensions. They and the eigenvectors automatically form representations of the unitary groups that map the now nonvanishing deficiency spaces onto another. The eigenvalues have orbits under these groups, which is reminiscent of and possibly deeply related to the Kaluza Klein mechanism. A priori, however, the orbit attached to a point, as far as point can be resolved on this geometry, is not in compactified dimensions. Instead, these group orbits are within the “point’s” unresolvable small patch of fuzzyness of size Δx_0 .

In the generic case, the unitary extensions of the symmetric $\mathbf{x}$ ’s Cayley transforms do not commute. Depending on the choice of short distance structure, the group of unitaries which are functions of the $\mathbf{x}_i$ only, i.e. the group of local gauge transformations, is therefore no longer commutative, as in the Yang Mills case. A detailed account is in progress. For preliminary results see [16].

References

- [1] P.K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. **D15**, 2795 (1976)
- [2] D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, G. Veneziano, Phys.Lett. **B216** 41, (1989)
- [3] L.J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A10**, 145 (1995)
- [4] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen, J.E. Roberts, Comm. Math. Phys. **172**, 187 (1995)
- [5] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz, E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, CUP, (1987)
- [6] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, AP (1994)
- [7] A. Connes, M.R. Douglas, A. Schwarz, RU-97-94, hep-th/9711162
- [8] B. DeWitt, in Les Houches 1983 proceedings, p.529ff (1985)
- [9] A. Kempf, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 1347 (1997)
- [10] D.J. Gross, P.F. Mende, Nucl. Phys. **B303**, 407 (1988)
- [11] E. Witten, Phys. Today **49** (4), 24 (1996)
- [12] A. Kempf, J. Math. Phys. **35** (9), 4483 (1994)
- [13] A. Kempf, J.Phys.**A30** 2093, (1997)
- [14] A. Kempf, in Proc. 21st Intl. Coll. Group Theoretical Methods in Physics (ICGTMP 96), Goslar, July 1996, hep-th/9612082
- [15] A. Kempf, G. Mangano, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 7909 (1997)
- [16] A. Kempf, Europhys. Lett. **40** (3), 257 (1997), hep-th/9706213